CENTRAL FAX CENTER PAGE 01

JAN 0 5 2009 PTO/SB/21 (07-06)

Under the Panament	Reduction Act of 1995, no perso	U.S.	Patent and Trades	nank Office:	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
		Application Number	lection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control ou 10/885,258		
TRANS	SMITTAL	Filing Date	09/20/2003		
FORM		First Named Inventor	KURUP, SHREE		
		Art Unit	3711		
(to be used for all come	spondence after initial filing)	Examiner Name	MS. LEGESSE		
Total Number of Pages I		Attorney Docket Number	KURUP-3		
Fuel column					
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)					
Fee Transmittal	Form	Drawing(s)		After	Allowance Communication to TC
Fee Attac	thed Dent	Licensing-related Papers			al Communication to Board beats and Interferences
Amendment/Rep		Petition Petition to Convert to a	etition to Convert to a		al Communication to TC al Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
After Final		Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation		j Propr 1	ietary Information
Affidavits/declaration(s)		Change of Correspondence Address		_	Engles une (a) (places the state
Extension of Tim	e Request	Terminal Disclaimer	. ∟	below	Enclosure(s) (please identify):
Express Abandonment Request Request for Refund					
Information Disclosure Statement CD, Number of CD(s)					
Landscape Table on CD					
Certified Copy of	Priority Rema	<u> </u>			
Document(s)	RESPO	RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANT BRIEF ATTN: REGINALD TYSON,			
Reply to Missing Parts/ SPECIALIST. APPELLANT RATIFIES THE PREVIOUSLY FILED BRIEF. A COPY OF PAGE Incomplete Application 15, SIGNED, IS ALSO DISCLOSED. IF A PROBLEM PLEASE TELEPHONE 978-687-3060					
Reply to Missing Parts EMAIL ROBNATHANS@AOL.COM. THANK YOU. PAGE 4 ENCLOSED ALSO (STATUS OF Under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53					
Onder 37	OFR 1.52 01 1.55	. ,			
CIONATURE OF ARRUGANT ATTORNEY OF ACENE					
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT					
	RT NATHANS				
Signature Works					
Printed name ROBERT NATHANS					
Date 01/05/	2009		Reg. No. 19,	558	
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING					
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450. Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:					
Signature M. M.					
Typed or printed name ROBERT NATHANS				Date	01/05/2009

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to fite (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS, SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, cell 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-40 and 50-54 are cancelled.

JAN 0 5 2009

Claims 41-49, 55 and 56, the claims on appeal, all stand rejected under 35 U,S.C. 103(a).

The outer adhesive layer not only supports the lens but has the convenient dual function of receiving and supporting a label carrying the aforesaid message upon the eye patch.

CLAIMS 49 AND 43, 44

It is respectfully submitted that the use of an old discarded lens in applicant's eye patch is a new and unobvious use of an old lens that would otherwise be thrown away. Who would think of using her old normally discarded lens in this highly unusual manner? The user of applicant's novelty eye patch who uses an old discarded lens in the eye patch is not a manufacturer saving manufacturing costs as asserted by the examiner. The supplier of the eye patch does not supply the old discarded lens of the wearer. The wearer has already paid for her new up to date corrective lenses. This clever feature should be independently patentable and is not suggested by the references.

CLAIMS 55, 56

Claims 55 and 56 are quite similar to claim 41. While eye patches are widely understood to be flexible, this limitation has been dropped since it may be practical to provide an eye patch that is relatively ridged, which however may complicate having the eye patch fit securely upon the user's face. Also the fastening devices could constitute something other than adhesives like, for instance, elastic straps about the wearer's head.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert L. Nathans

Registration # 19,558.

978-667-3060; robnathans@aol.com